## Remarks

The Office Action and the references cited therein have been carefully reviewed. The following remarks herein are considered to be responsive thereto. Claims 1-18 remain in this application. Claims 5 and 14 are presently amended by this amendment.

## Objections as to Form

The Examiner objected to the specification due to page 9, line 3 of the specification reading "the difficulty to fine them," to which the Examiner expressed the line should read "the difficulty to find them." Applicant has requested that the line be amended above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to Claim 5 due to line 3 reciting the limitation "the list" without an apparent antecedent basis. Applicant has amended Claim 5 as referenced above. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to Claim 5 be withdrawn.

The Examiner also objected to Claim 14 due to line 7 reciting, "certificates Comprises." Applicant has amended Claim 14 as referenced above. Applicant respectfully request that the objection to Claim 14 be withdrawn.

## Rejections as to Substance

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,301,658 issued to Koehler (Koehler) in view of US Patent No. 6,021,510 issued to Nachenberg (Nachenberg).

9

The patent to Koehler discloses a method and system to authenticate digital certificates issued by an organization's authentication hierarchy. Koehler teaches that requests are verification requests that are received from a plurality of clients (Fig 2, column 5, line 47). Further, Koehler teaches that a certificate authentication request is a request for validating a certificate, wherein the request never results in sending a certificate to the requester because the requester has already a certificate. Moreover, the cache includes a data file for storing information such as timestamp and expiration data in addition to issuer and user privileges (col. 6, lines 7-8).

The patent to Nachenberg discloses a system and method for verifying that a file does not contain viruses. The system includes a verification server and verification cache, wherein the verification server manages a certificate repository and the verification cache has entries for verified digital certificates and certification revocation lists. The verification server incrementally updates the verification cache using a recursive procedure to review the hierarchy's chain of authority signatures.

In regard to independent Claims 1, 17 and 18 of the presently claimed invention, the caching of anti-virus certificates is neither taught nor suggested by Koehler or Nachenberg, either alone or in combination.

In the presently claimed invention, requests are used to check whether certificates are available or not, wherein all certificates stored in the cache table are assumed to be valid. Conversely, Koehler teaches that requests are verification requests that are received from a plurality of clients.

In the presently claimed invention, the cache table contains only the most recent virus-free certificates, and upon request, these certificates are provided to a requester.

10

Further, the processes for removing certificates from the cache table or not storing certificates within the cache table are well known to those of skill within the art.

In contrast, Koehler discloses that the function of the cache is completely different from the presently claimed invention. Koehler teaches that a certificate authentication request is a request from a plurality of clients for the validation of a certificate, wherein the request never results in sending a certificate to the requester because the requester already possesses a certificate. Further, the cache disclosed by Koehler also includes a data file, which serves no useful purpose within the context of the present invention.

As admitted by the Examiner in the Office Action, Koehler does not disclose any use of virus-free certificates and supposes that the requester has the certificate plus the object of the certificate. The Examiner specifically states "Koehler fails to explicitly disclose the certificates pertain to viruses; certifying that a file is virus free. Furthermore, Koehler fails in his disclosure of the step of selecting in the cache table one virus-free certificate for the identified file, to include the limitation of 'using one or a plurality of anti-virus criteria.'"

To make up for the deficiency of Koehler the Examiner cited the disclosure of Nachenberg for disclosing that "certificates pertain to viruses; certifying that a file is virus-free (see col. 1, lines 12-22). However, the patent to Nachenberg discloses a method for verifying that a file does not contain viruses. Nachenberg is not related to certificates wherein one certificate is associated to one file. The fact that a file is declared virus-free (col. 1, line 17) does not mean that a certificate is built.

11

The Examiner further states "Nachenberg in an analogous art, clearly discloses the certificates pertain to viruses; certifying that a file is virus-free." Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner and submit that Nachenberg does not disclose the use of certificates such as described in the present invention.

The present invention allows for the use of a plurality of anti-virus software (including the software mentioned in Nachenberg), due to the fact that only the result of the anti-virus processing of a file is included in the certificate.

Nachenberg discloses a method for checking viruses (col. 3, line 20). The antivirus modules described in Nachenberg are used to speed up the virus checking function using multiple anti-virus checking methods. These anti-virus checking methods are included within an anti-virus software to improve the functionality of the anti-virus software.

In contrast, the present invention does not relate to this multiple virus checking function. The present invention rather lists the well-known anti-virus software (e.g., the brand, type and date). The fact that an anti-virus software uses a more sophisticated solution including multiple checking is considered as being inherent to the particular the software. For instance, in the presently claimed invention, the list of antivirus software includes "Norton level A" and "McAfee level B." According to the invention disclosed in Nachenberg, to detect viruses in a file, the Norton AntiVirus (NAV) software utilizes multiple modules including an antivirus accelerator module. This feature is not relevant to the presently claimed invention.

Nachenberg discloses that when a virus is detected an action is taken (e.g., informing the user that a virus is detected). When no virus is detected, the file is declared

as being virus-free. The process is different from the processes of the presently claimed invention.

Therefore, as mentioned above, the method of the presently claimed invention of caching anti-virus certificates is neither taught nor suggested by Koehler or Nachenberg, either alone or in combination. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 17 and 18 are thus allowable. The applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Further, Claims 2 -16, which depend from Claim 1, are allowable therewith at least because they depend from an allowable base claim. Consequently, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of Claims 2-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Fischman
Registration No. 34,594

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
SF:WAP:jf

13